

**File name:** REH1-032.pdf

**CCLAS sessions involved:** Recording sessions throughout the Billy corpus

- All records have been sorted by segment time (i.e., chronologically)
  - Margaret and I watched chunks of a video recording, and then we went back through to discuss individual records. We focused on productions involving nouns inflected with the possessive morpheme *-im*.
  - For most selected utterances, I asked Margaret to provide an adult-like pronunciation for the target. For each pronunciation, I speak an English translation, and then M. provides the adult-like Cree target. We provide some commentary/discussion for many targets. All utterances written below are from Billy, unless indicated otherwise.
  - Time stamps in the notes below mark times in the audio recording REH1-032.wav
  - The equals sign  $\leq$ , when used, indicates a morpheme break.
  - The term "Target" indicates an adult-like pronunciation for what Billy was trying to say. If Margaret provided a pronunciation for a Target, then that is indicated with a timestamp.
- 

**Session 4:** Billy is age 04;06.08

**Record 333**

mânâ=tâh âi pâshuch n=ûhku=m ây=iht=â=t

'Over there, my grandmother's place.'

- His production is adult-like
- **Target:** 00:22

**368**

n=ûhtâwî

'my father'

- His production is adult-like
- **Target** :00:57

**521**

mi=shtikwânipîwî=h

'hair'

- **Target:** 01:08
- Here Billy is using the indefinite possessor prefix mi-
- I elicited other words here, for comparison. The final -h is the inanimate plural, which shows up as final stress:
  - nishtikwânipîwîh 'my hair' (01:19)
  - chishtikwânipîwîh 'my hair' (01:26)
  - chishtikwânipîwîh 'my hair' (01:40)

**524**

âi ni=shtikwânipîwî=h

'my hair'

- **Target:** 01:26, 01:46
- Margaret confirms Billy produces all morphology here.

**529**

ni=htiwîkî=h

'my ears'

- **Target:** 02:02
- Margaret confirms Billy produces all morphology here.

531

ni=skut

'my nose'

- **Target:** 02:14
- Margaret confirms Billy produces all morphology here.

536

ni=ch=îpit=h

'my teeth'

**Target** is ni=îpit=h: 02:35

- Margaret confirms Billy produces two person prefixes, which is a child-like error. It's possible that Billy has 'tooth/teeth' stored as a form with an unanalyzed second-person possessor prefix chi-. I checked the rest of the corpus, and he doesn't say 'tooth/teeth' anywhere else, so I can't be sure.
- Margaret also confirms that Billy produces the final -h, which is the inanimate plural

540

ni=tihchî=h

'my hands'

- Margaret confirms Billy produces all morphology here.
- **Target:** 02:58

739

apishâsh=i=yiu wîyi u=chimney=im

'His chimney is small'

- **Target:** 04:17
- Margaret confirms that Billy says the u- and -im. He produces no final -h, which is adult-like. The <wîyi> is the possessor.
- Good example of a mis-match in animacy between English and Cree lexemes (03:11): Margaret notes that Billy is categorizing English "chimney" as inanimate, because he uses the inanimate intransitive verb to modify it. The Cree word for 'chimney', though, is animate <akuhtishkwaayaapii>. Margaret says that "chimney"/<akuhtishkwaayaapii> are uncommon words in Cree, so perhaps Billy's production and classification of the word are novel. In this session, Billy says "chimney" several times, but the word does not appear in the rest of corpus (whether in Billy's or the adult's speech)—so perhaps it is rare.

---

**Session 5:** Billy is age 04;06.23

46

tânitâh kê iituhtitaat nnnsh umâtiwâkinishh

'Where did little nnn take her toys?'

- **Target:** 04:53
- Margaret confirms that Billy says all the morphology with 'her toys'

- ‘Toy’ is inanimate in Cree, but I don’t think there’s a VTI in Cree for ‘take’—so Billy uses the VTA form of ‘take’ here. I don’t think it’s an error per se, because Margaret didn’t mention that.

## 66

u=stâs=h

‘her older brother?’

- Target: 05:08
- Margaret confirms that Billy produces all morphology correctly. Good example of conflation with final –h: The noun is an animate obviative, so it should take –h ... but Billy is also using question intonation, which is indicated with a final –h too.
- I elicited a couple of related targets here (I think the stress shift is clear, from first- and second-person possessors to the third-person form taking obviative -h):
- nistâs ‘my older brother’ (05:37)
- chistâs ‘your older brother’ (05:43)
- ustâsh (05:48)

## 97

nimimâh âi u=kâwî=h

‘No, um, his mother’

- Target: 05:54
- Margaret confirms all morphology present.
- I elicited a couple of related targets here (I think the stress shift is clear, from first- and second-person possessors to the third-person form taking obviative –h, and the –h shows up clearly as final breathiness):
- nikâwî ‘my mother’ (06:08)
- chikâwî ‘your mother’ (06:13)
- ukâwîh ‘his mother’ (06:15)

## 345

chîyi chi=skidoo=sh=im

‘Your little skidoo’

- Target: 06:19
- The Cree word for ‘skidoo’ is <kaaushtaakunichipihataat>, which is animate. It’s also much longer and morphologically complex than English “skidoo”, and I’ll bet that “skidoo” is more common in adult speech as well.
- Mismatch in –im: The Cree word <kaaushtaakunichipihataat> does not take –im, but Billy uses –im with English “skidoo”. Margaret also uses –im here, so that is adult-like.

## 533

awân ani=yâ u=toothbrush=im=h

‘whose toothbrush is that?’

- Target: 06:32
  - “toothbrush” is inanimate for Margaret. She confirms Billy produces final -h, but it’s impossible to know if it’s a question -h or animate obviative -h. I’ll count it as question -h, giving Billy the benefit of the doubt, although Margaret suspects it’s an error.
  - Billy does say <aniyaa> with no -h, which is the correct inanimate obviative form.
-

## Session 6: Billy is age 04;07.27

666

u=stis=ich=h

'his mittens?'

- Target: 07:07
  - Margaret confirms Billy produces both <ch> and final <h>. I think the final /h/ is the question marker. Billy's uses of animate proximate plural <ch> is a particular error: 'his mittens' should be obviative and therefore take the animate obviative -h.
  - I elicited a couple of related targets here:
  - nistisich 'my mittens' (06:59)—clear animate proximate plural suffix here
  - chistisich 'your mittens' (07:03)—clear animate proximate plural suffix here
  - ustish 'his mittens' (07:07)—here the suffix is the inanimate obviative/plural -h
- 

## Session 7: Billy is age 04;08.21

1

nit=tâm=inân

'our dog' (exclusive)

- Target: 08:00

9

nâ=tâh wâhyiu chîh=uht=in=â=u my dad

'My dad got it from far away, over there.'

- Target: 08:11

46

u=chûchû=yiu u=pîpî=m=ish=h

her bottle ... her little baby's (bottle)

- Target: 08:48
- Checked with Margaret: Billy is talking about Ani's doll and the bottle that belongs to the doll. Great example of a construction with an obviative possessor, where Billy correctly marks that possessor on the possessee via -yiu
- Margaret confirms that Billy should have used -im with bottle but did not produce that
- Margaret confirms production of final -h with 'her little baby'.

384

mâu=yâyiu u=skut

'here is his nose'

- Target: 09:25
- The possessor is the puppy from the preceding records.
- Margaret confirms all morphology is present, with no animate /h/ on the demonstrative.
- Nice example of the obviative demonstrative agreeing with the possessee.

390

mâu=yâyiu u=tun

'Here is his mouth;

- Same structure as in record 294.
- Margaret confirms all morphology is present, with no animate /h/ on the demonstrative.

- Nice example of the obviative demonstrative agreeing with the possessee.
- Target: 09:40

**392**

mâu=yâyiu u=shchîshikw=h

'Here are his eyes'

- **Target:** 09:53
- Margaret confirms that Billy is omitting the required inanimate plural /h/ from the end of the demonstrative, but Billy does correctly produce the inanimate plural /h/ with 'eyes'

**395**

mâu=yâyiu mâu=yâyiu u=htiwikî=h

'here is, here is, his ears'

- **Target:** 10:50
- Again, Margaret confirms that Billy is omitting the required inanimate plural /h/ from the end of the demonstrative, but Billy does correctly produce the inanimate plural /h/ with 'ears'

**Session 8:** Billy is age 04;09:14

**71**

âi ni=chîh=utitâm=ihu=kw=∅ nnn nîchi=nâ=hch

'um, nnn hit me at our house'

- **Target:** 11:13
- Margaret confirms Billy produces all morphology with <nîchi=nâ=hch> 'our house'
- I elicited some related structures:
- wîch 'home' (12:02)
- N-îch 'my home' (12:06)
- N-îch-inâ-hch 'at my house' (11:31)--morphologically, it's 'our' EXCL
- Ch-îch-wâ-hch 'at your house' (11:37)--morphologically, it's 'your' (PL)

**614**

drop=s wâsh chîh=pichist=in=ikiniu=uh my eye=s=ihch

'Drops were put in my eye.'

- Target 12:35
- Margaret hears Billy say <my eyes=ihch>, so the English plural shows up before the locative. The Cree plural wouldn't.
- I elicited some related structures
- Ni-shchîshikw 'my eye' (12:55)
- Ni-shchîshikw-h 'my eyes' (12:59)
- Ni-shchîshikw-hch 'in my eye' (13:06)
- Ni-shchîshikw-hch 'in my eye' (13:15, 13:22)—Margaret remarks that "It's the same" as with singular 'eye'. That's because the LOC suffix precludes the inanimate plural suffix.

**618**

nîshwâu wâsh mikw ni=chîh=ît=ikw=∅ n=ikâwî

'my mother told me twice' (meaning two applications for the drops in his eyes)

- Target: 14:07

- Margaret confirms all morphology is produced by Billy
- 

## Session 9: Billy is age 04;10:08

78

k=ûhku=m sâkihîkin=ihch âshkw iht=â=wich  
'they're still at Grandma Lake'

- Billy is saying the name of the lake, but he has mis-analyzed the name: He thinks it's 'Grandma('s) lake', because the first word in the name is close in pronunciation to <kûhkum>. However, the first word in the name actually refers to some kind of fish. (Margaret isn't sure which kind of fish.)
- **Target** for what Billy is trying to say: 14:55

135

chi=mushu=m tâpâ nûhchi=ut=in=â=u fish  
'my grandpa. i didn't take (catch) any fish'

- The first part of this < chi=mushu=m> is Billy answering a question about who he was with. The rest is its own sentence.
- **Target**: 15:21
- This is a good example of an unanalyzed word: <chimushum> should actually be <nimushum> 'My grandpa'. So a clear similarity between 'grandma' and 'grandpa' in child speech.

684

u=skidoo=m=h wâsh kiyâh chîh=iht=â=yiuh  
'her skidoo was there too'

- **Target**: 16:48 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret confirms that Billy produces the 3 prefix and final -h on 'her skidoo'. These are both correct.
- However, Margaret explains that Billy is using a non-adultlike allomorph for 'her': an adult would use [ʊt] instead of just [ʊ]
- Spoken target for <kaaushaakunichihtaata> 'skidoo' (animate) is at 16:11
- The Cree word for 'skidoo' takes -im when possessed: <nikaashuhtaakunichihtaatim> 'my skidoo' (16:18)

748

ni=nipâwin=ihch  
'on my bed'

- **Target**: 17:19 in REH1-032.wav
  - I elicited a few related structures:
  - Ni-nipâwin 'my bed' (17:22)
  - Ni-nipâwin-ihch 'on my beds' (17:31)—good example showing that number marking can't appear when the locative is present
  - u-nipâwin 'his bed' (17:26)—no final stress, because no final -h
-

**Session 11:** Billy is age 05;00.13

**201**

îhî tâisp châ=pimu=htâ=t û ni=shîm=ish

'Yes, when is my little sister going to walk?'

- **Target:** 17:40 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret confirms Billy's production is adult-like
- <û> refers to 'my little sister'

**233**

u=friend=im=h mâk wîyi âi

'what about her friend, um'

- **Target:** 18:06 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret confirms Billy produces all morphology. The <wîyi> is the possessor of the friend.

**234**

tân âsinihkâsuyich-h u=friend=im=h

'What is the name of her friend?'

Target: 18:25 in REH1-032.wav

Margaret confirms it's an adult-like production and that Billy produces all morphology.

**367**

mishkiw=â=u ni=window=m=inân

'Our window is very hard.'

- Target: No target elicited here
- Margaret confirms that Billy does say <ni=window=m=inân>, with -im.
- I elicited some related structures/words
- Waasaanihtaakin 'window' (19:26)
- Niwaasaanihtaakinim 'my window' (19:31)—so the Cree word for 'window' takes -im when possessed; but Margaret says that it might be OK to say it without -im too (19:39). The Cree dictionary indicates that 'window' takes -im.

**411**

îhî tâpâ uhchi=pîku=h=am=∅ n=îch=inân

'Yes, he didn't break our house.'

- Target: 19:56
- Margaret says Billy produces <n=îch=inân> 'our home' when he should be saying <n=îch=inân=yiu>, which has the obviative suffix too. Good example of a noun with an SAP possessor still requiring obviative -yiu.
- With the verb, Billy says <chuhchi pîkuham> instead of the adult-like production in the Orth <uhchi=pîku=h=am>

**559**

ni=bicycle=im wâsh iht=â=u

'my bicycle is there'

- Target: 20:29 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret says it's an on-target production, but Billy does the same thing Daisy does with <ni=bicycle=im>: He says [i] in the -im instead of producing a more lax vowel. The morphology is still good, though.

- The Cree dictionary indicates that the Cree word for bicycle is <kaatihtipishkiwaakiniwit> (nap) and does not take –im
  - “Bicycle” is another likely example of kids using the English word for something, where a Cree word is available but it’s pretty long and probably rare in adult speech too.
- 

## Session 12: Billy is age 05;01.07

### 323

îhî chîh pikupiyiyiu ustomachim  
 ‘yes, his stomach was broken’

- Margaret confirms that Billy produces no final –h on ‘his stomach, which signifies that Billy treats it as inanimate, as is the Cree word for ‘stomach’
  - **Target:** 21:54 in REH1-032.wav
  - I elicited some related words/structures
  - ut-ichishî ‘his/her stomach’ (21:19, 21:38)
  - nit-ichishî ‘my stomach’ (21:23, 21:35)
- 

## Session 13: Billy is age 05;02.12

### 354

awân û=yâh  
 ‘whose are these?’

- **Target:** 22:29 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret confirms Billy is saying <uyaah>, with the final –h. The referent is a toy car, so the demonstrative is the animate obviative form.

### 355

awân û=yâh u=car=im=iwâu=h  
 ‘Whose car is this?’

- **Target:** 23:46 in REH1-032.wav
  - Margaret hears Billy produce correctly the -h with uyaah and –h after <waau>. She also hears Billy produce the –im.
  - Billy’s use of <waau> implies that the car belongs to more than one person, so there is an agreement error of omission: He’s missing the plural suffix <chii> with the possessor <awaan> ‘who’.
  - Margaret also provides the target for ‘their car’ in only Cree (so no English “car”)-- utaapaanaaskwâuh (24:00). The Cree word ‘car’ takes no -im, so there’s a difference with English “car”
- 

## Session 14: Billy is age 05;03.22

### 64

tâpâ ihtâu âi=hch ni-classroom-ihch



'he's not in my classroom'

- **Target:** 24:18 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret confirms that Billy produces all morphology. She also says there is no clear Cree word available for "classroom, so that may explain the English in this particular case.
- There is no -im here with 'in my classroom', but I wonder if that's a function of phonology, because the stem ends in [m]

137

tâni=yâ ut=ishtutin

'where is his hat?'

- **Target:** 24:40 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret confirms Billy produces all morphology, and (correctly) there is no final -h on 'hat'
- I elicited some related structures/words
- ashtutin 'hat' (25:00)
- nishtutin 'my hat' (25:04)
- utishtutin 'his hat' (25:07)

139

iyaau aa utishtutin

'does he have his hat?'

- **Target:** 25:12 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret hears the question particle.
- This is a good example of a construction not requiring a relational verb: Because it's his own hat (and not the hat of somebody else), the verb does not take a relational form.

166

mâu=tâh wâsh âtwâch u=pîpî=m=ish=h mom nimâ

'this is how they sound, her baby and mom, right?'

- **Target:** 26:06 in REH1-032.wav
- <aatwaach> = 'they sound'. Billy's verb isn't totally on-target (the one in the Orth is on target, but he changes the pronunciation).
- Margaret hears all morphology on 'her baby'.
- Margaret says using the word "mom" in this context is very un-adultlike. It seems the issue is using the human term "mom" for an animal. Instead, she says Billy should have said <nisk> 'goose' for the mother of the baby.

179

n=itihchî

'my hand'

- Margaret says his production is adult-like.
- **Target:** 26:37 in REH1-032.wav

197

awân aniyâh u-keys-im=h

'whose keys are those?'

- **Target:** 26:49 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret confirms the production of -im and final -h, which is the inanimate plural.

- This is an interesting example, because Billy has the English plural attached to the English stem. Could be an unanalyzed form: a key often comes in a group.
- The Cree word for 'his/her keys' would be <ut=aapihiikin=h> (27:02)—no –im is used with the Cree word. That is a difference between the Cree and English words.

## 270

u=socks=im mikw ni=wâp=iht=im=w=ân

'I only see her socks'

- Target: 27:25 in REH1-032.wav
- Great example of a relational verb: Billy is seeing something that has a possessor, so the relational is needed.
- The Cree word for 'sock' does not take –im, so this is another example of the difference between the Cree and English word.
- Another good example of an English plural inside Cree possessive morphology, like "keys". I wonder if "socks" may also be stored as an unanalyzed unit because a sock usually occurs in a pair (i.e., as a plural).

## 274

mikw u=socks=im=h ni=chîh wâp=iht=im=w=ân ni=chîh itaayihimwaan âi

'I only saw her socks, I thought ...'

- Target: 27:49
- Two relational verbs, but Margaret indicates this structure isn't entirely adult-like ... but it was hard to put her finger on it. Couldn't quite figure it out.

## 283

awân u=yâh u=chip=s=im=h

'Whose chips are these?'

- Target: 28:31 in REH1-032.wav
- Billy produces all morphology from Orthography
- This is another English word that has the plural inside Cree morphology: Again, likely an unanalyzed plural form, because when people talk about a chip it's always in a group of chips.
- Margaret says there's no obvious Cree word for "chips", so that may explain why Billy uses the English word.

## Session 15: Billy is age 05;05.00

## 237

nîyi û utâpânâskw=sh

'this is my little car'

- **Target:** 29:29 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret is confident that Billy omits the first-person prefix *ni-* here. This is a child error.
- I elicited some related words/structures:
- utaapaanaaskwish 'little car' (28:56)
- nitutaapaanaaskwish 'my little car' (29:02)—no –im for the possessive form

**480**

mikw nit=ânishkiw=ish=îm=h

'only my great grandparent'

- **Target:** 29:39 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret confirms that Billy produces all morphology.
- Great example of a noun taking the obviative ending even though possessor is first-person, because the sister is established as proximate a couple of records before this

**495**

pâshchishikin=ish awân u=yâ

'the little gun, whose is it?'

- **Target:** 30:06 in REH1-032.wav
  - Margaret confirms that the word 'gun' is not possessive, and that's OK in this context (because it's in a different clause). She also says Billy does not incorrectly produce a final -h with the demonstrative, so his production is adult-like.
- 

**Session 17:** Billy is age 05;06.27

**365**

u=sled=im=iwâu=h Dora

'This their sled, Dora (and somebody else)'

- Target: 30:38 in REH1-032.wav
  - Margaret is confident that Billy is saying <usledimiwaauh> and that his production is adult-like, including the final animate obviative -h.
  - The plural possessor suffix -iwaau implies that the sled belongs to Dora and somebody else.
  - In the East Cree dictionary, the Cree word for 'sled' is <taatiyaakinaaskw> (animate) and does not take -im, so that's another difference between a Cree word and its English counterpart.
- 

**Session 18:** Billy is age 05;10.06

**450**

oh nnn=h u=shîm=ish=h

'nnn is her (his mom's) little brother'

- Margaret hears all morphology on 'brother'.
- **Target:** 31:03 in REH1-032.wav
- Elicited some related words/targets:
- ushîmishh (31:03)
- nishîmish 'my brother' (31:08)

**452**

nnn u=brother=im=h nimâ

'nnn's brother, right?'

- Target: 31:22 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret hears all morphology with 'brother'.

- This one is a really good example of the animate obviative suffix coming through clearly as aspiration after the nasal.
- Also a good example of the difference between the Cree and English word for the same thing 'brother': In Cree, -im is not used on any word for 'brother'

#### 454

nimui shâsh u=shîm=ish=h ani=yâh shâsh u=brother=im=h ani=yâh  
 'He's not her "ushîmishh" anymore, he's her ubrotherimh now'

- **Target:** 31:53 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret says Billy produces all morphology in an adult-like manner
- This record is really interesting, because it provides direct insight into how Billy conceives of the relationship between Cree and English words for kinship (see Notes tier): He is indicating that Billy thinks that the Cree word, which has a diminutive morpheme, is used when you are little kids ... and now he's talking about his adult mother and her younger sibling, Billy says that he is his mother's "brother"

#### 502

n= ûtâpânâsku=shi=ch  
 'my little cars'

- **Target:** 32:20 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret confirms the production of all morphology here

#### 607

ani=yâh û=yâh u=piyichîs=im=h  
 'those, these pants of his'

- **Target:** 32:33 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret confirms all morphology is present. Clear example of the word-final obviative [h] surfacing when preceding the vowel-initial possessee.

#### 688

awân mâk ani=yâh u=goalie.stick=im  
 'but whose goalie stick is that?'

- **Target:** 32:59 in REH1-032.wav
- Margaret says "goalie stick" is inanimate and correctly lacks final -h, but Billy incorrectly uses an -h on the DEM.